

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicants: Guolin Ma et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,317

Filed: July 11, 2003

Docket No.: 10020800-1

Title: OPTICAL CONDUIT FOR CHANNELING LIGHT ONTO A SURFACE

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006. Claims 1, 3-8, 12, and 13 were rejected. With this Response, no claims have been amended. Claims 1, 3-8, 12, and 13 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for being unpatentable over the Pelka et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,697,924, in view of the Dimmick U.S. Patent No. 5,151,679, and further in view of the Butterworth et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,847,507.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for being unpatentable over the Pelka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,697,924, in view of the Dimmick U.S. Patent No. 5,151,679, and further in view of the Zimmerman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,869,206.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for being unpatentable over the Pelka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,697,924, in view of the Dimmick U.S. Patent No. 5,151,679, in view of the Butterworth et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,847,507, and further in view of the Son U.S. Patent No. 6,741,234.

The Examiner admits that the Pelka et al. patent does not disclose the limitations of independent claim 1 of the light source embedded at the input end of the body. Furthermore, the Examiner admits that the Pelka et al. patent does not disclose the limitations of independent claim 1 of a reflector cup embedded at the input end of the body and surrounding the light source, the reflector cup configured to redirect light from the light source towards the output end of the body.

First, the Examiner cites the Dimmick patent, which discloses a display sign including light pipes made of light-transmitting material. In the Dimmick patent, the light pipes, such as light pipe 80 illustrated in Figure 3, have two ends having disposed at each end light-emitting diodes embedded within the ends. Each light source is directed towards another end of the light pipe in the direction of extension of the light pipe and a portion of the outer surface of each light pipe is translucent permitting light to exit therefrom. In the Dimmick patent, energizing each of the emitted light sources causes light to be transmitted in each light

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicants: Guolin Ma et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,317

Filed: July 11, 2003

Docket No.: 10020800-1

Title: OPTICAL CONDUIT FOR CHANNELING LIGHT ONTO A SURFACE

pipe and light from the light pipe emerges through the translucent outer surface of each light pipe for the display of the predetermined message or design.

Therefore, the Dimmick patent teaches a way from embedding a light source at the input end of a body having an input end for light input, an output end for light output, and a curved surface that **totally and internally reflects light from the input end towards the output end** as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, the Dimmick patent includes light sources at both ends of the light pipe, and light emerges through the translucent outer surface of each light pipe for the display of predetermined messages or designs.

The Examiner specifically recites the Dimmick patent at column 3, line 63-column 4, line 1 for motivation to combine with the Pelka et al. patent. However, at column 3, line 63-column 4, line 1, the Dimmick patent specifically states that light pipes having light-emitting diodes embedded in the ends thereof which illuminate only the letters of the display sign or the pattern of the display and which substantially reduces the maintenance and cost of operation of such exit signs. This language specifically refers to the translucent feature of each light pipe being such that the translucent light pipes permit light to exit therefrom and emerging light through the translucent outer surface of each light pipe provides the display of the predetermined message or design. Thus, the Dimmick display sign would not work with an optical conduit according to claim 1 having a body with an input end for light input, an output end for light output, and a curved surface that totally and internally reflects light from the input end towards the output end.

In addition, the Examiner admits that the combination of the Pelka et al. patent and the Dimmick patent does not disclose the limitations of independent claim 1 of a reflector cup embedded at the input end of the body and surrounding the light source, the reflector cup configured to redirect light from the light source towards the output end of the body.

The Examiner sites the Butterworth et al. patent which discloses a light emitting diode that is attached and wire bonded into a reflector cup lead frame. The Examiner specifically sites the Butterworth patent at column 2, line 7-16 which states that the apparatus described in the Butterworth et al. patent produces efficient light emitting diodes over a broad portion of the visible spectrum via a lens containing a florescent dye over molded to a short wavelength light emitting die placed within a reflector cup. However, the Butterworth et al. patent does not teach or suggest or provide motivation to have a light source embedded at the

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicants: Guolin Ma et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,317

Filed: July 11, 2003

Docket No.: 10020800-1

Title: OPTICAL CONDUIT FOR CHANNELING LIGHT ONTO A SURFACE

input end of a body formed from optically transmissive material, and having a curved surface that totally internally reflects light from the input end towards the output end, and a reflector cup embedded at the input end of the body and surrounding the light source, the reflector cup configured to redirect light from the light source towards the output end of the body as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Pelka et al. patent, the Dimmick patent, and the Butterworth et al. patent, alone or in combination. Furthermore, dependent claims 3-7 further define patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, these dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for being unpatentable over the Son U.S. Patent No. 6,741,234 in view of the Zimmerman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,869,206 and further in view of the Dimmick U.S. Patent No. 5,151,679 and further in view of the Butterworth et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,847,507.

The Examiner admits that the Son patent does not disclose an optical conduit having a curved interior surface as recited in independent claim 1 or an optical conduit having an interior surface as recited in independent claim 13 and does not disclose the limitations of both independent claims 8 and 13 of a light source embedded within the optical conduit, and a reflector cup embedded within the optical conduit and surrounding the light source.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that the combination of the Son patent and the Zimmerman et al. patent do not together disclose the limitations of independent claims 8 and 13 of the light source embedded into the optical conduit and a reflector cup embedded around the light source and configured to redirect light towards the output end of the optical conduit.

Again, as with independent claim 1, the Examiner cites the Dimmick patent. The above remarks with regard to the Dimmick patent and independent claim 1 also apply to independent claims 8 and 13. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Dimmick patent discloses a light pipe which by design allows light to emerge through the translucent outer surface of each light pipe for display of the predetermined message or design. Thus, the Dimmick light pipe design would not work in an optical mouse which needs an optical conduit to transmit light from an input end and to an output end as recited in independent claims 8 and 13. Moreover, as recited in independent claims 8 and 13, the optical conduit

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicants: Guolin Ma et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,317

Filed: July 11, 2003

Docket No.: 10020800-1

Title: OPTICAL CONDUIT FOR CHANNELING LIGHT ONTO A SURFACE

provides an interior surface that totally and internally reflects light from the input end towards the output end which is the opposite effect than which is achieved with a light pipe.

In addition, the Examiner admits that the combination of the Son patent, the Zimmerman et al. patent, and the Dimmick patent do not disclose a reflector cup embedded within the input end of an optical conduit and surrounding the light source, the reflector cup configured to redirect light from the light source toward the output end of the optical conduit as recited in independent claims 8 and 13. The above remarks with regard to independent claim 1 as to an optical conduit and the Butterworth et al. patent not teaching, suggesting, or providing motivation to embed a light source within the input end of the optical conduit and embed a reflector cup within the input end of the optical conduit and surrounding the light source, the reflector cup configured to redirect light from the light source towards the output end of the optical conduit, also apply to these limitations of independent claims 8 and 13. In addition, as to independent claims 8 and 13, the Butterworth et al. patent does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation to provide the above limitations in an optical conduit which is included in an optical mouse.

Therefore, the combination of the Son patent, the Zimmerman et al. patent, the Dimmick patent, and the Butterworth et al. patent do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, independent claims 8 and 13. Furthermore, dependent claim 12 further defines patentably distinct independent claim 8. Therefore, dependent claim 12 is also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections to claims 1, 3-8, 12, and 13, and request allowance of these claims.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicants: Guolin Ma et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,317

Filed: July 11, 2003

Docket No.: 10020800-1

Title: OPTICAL CONDUIT FOR CHANNELING LIGHT ONTO A SURFACE

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 3-8, 12, and 13 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3-8, 12, and 13 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Patrick G. Billig at Telephone No. (612) 573-2003, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or Michael Goodwin at Telephone No. (303) 298-9888, Facsimile No. (303) 297-2266. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.

P.O. Box 1920

Denver, Colorado 80201-1920

Respectfully submitted,

Guolin Ma et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC


Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street


Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-2003

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: April 24, 2006
PGB:dmw
Patrick G. Billig
Reg. No. 38,080

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 24 day of April, 2006.

By 
Name: Patrick G. Billig